

Strategic CSR and Sustainability

1. Course Description and Objectives

Firms are increasingly incorporating social issues in their strategic agenda. This results from the increased awareness of society by phenomena such as climate change, water stress, depletion of natural resources, pollution, shifting demographics, poverty, inequality and so on. The scope and scale of these developments challenge the rules of markets and create new success factors for the survival of individual companies. In this context, corporations need to develop new competitive competencies to recognize and address emerging threats and to leverage emerging opportunities to support society's quest for sustainability and survival on this planet while securing the survival and profitability of their own. Yet, how to create a sustainable competitive advantage remains as the "holy grail" of managerial decision-making. The goal of this intense-reading course is to tackle social issues in management from a strategic perspective.

More specifically, the objectives of this seminar course are to:

- provide an overview of the current state of the art of the field of Strategic CSR and Sustainability
- understand the role of different actors defining social challenges and the strategic processes that firms adopt to respond to them successfully
- understand the managerial implications of looking at "sustainability" from various perspectives.
- critically investigate some of the major conceptual, empirical, and practical works in the field, and
- advance the state of knowledge of strategic CSR and Sustainability by developing a potentially publishable article.

2. Requirements

There are three main requirements for successfully completing this class:

1. Class participation
 2. Research idea presentation
 3. Theoretical or empirical article
1. This course is organized as a seminar. You will get out of the course what you put in it. Regular attendance and participation are critical to your successful completion of this course. You are expected to come to class prepared to discuss all the material assigned and to contribute to class discussion. In addition to class participation, each student is required to take the lead in presenting and discussing 1 or 2 papers each week. You are welcome to choose a topic/paper that is of particular interest to you. You are responsible for communicating to us in a timely fashion who will be in charge of what for each class. Note however that ALL students are expected to be well familiar with all required readings. As this is a second year (advanced) course, you are expected to go beyond the readings and preparation questions and think about the implications for future research in the specific area. Class participation and lead discussion will count for 30% toward your final grade. In an effort to reduce the amount of paper used for this course, only required readings will be printed. Optional course readings can be easily accessed on-line (or ask the professor directly in case you are not able to find them). You later decide yourself how much and in which format you want to print material for easy reading.
 2. You are expected to present and discuss a "research idea". This need not be a full-blown research proposal, but rather an opportunity for you to choose an issue that is of interest to you, and spend some time thinking about what you need to do in order to accomplish it, and how it would expand the boundaries of the field. The presentation will be similar to the "elevator pitch" format where in a few minutes (about 5) you will have to present in class your research idea considering several aspects such as the importance of the problem, research question, relevant literature, expected results, measures and data sources, etc. Then, a round of Q&As will be carried out by your classmates. These presentations will be scheduled toward the end of the course and will count for 20% toward your final grade.
 3. You are expected to write up a theoretical or empirical article. The paper has to be 15-20 (double spaced) page long (without appendixes and references) and include a clear research question, review of the relevant literature, theoretical framework and propositions (if theoretical). If empirical, a clear description of variables, sample and data sources must be included. In both cases, a discussion and conclusion section has to be included. You are welcome to use and develop the idea used in the elevator pitch presentation. You can consider this as a take-home exam; it will count 50% toward the definition of your final grade. Paper is due March, 21st.

3. Outline

SESSION	DESCRIPTION	CASO
1	<p><i>Please decide the distribution among yourselves, and let me know who will be in charge of what by January 9th. Make sure that ALL papers are assigned and have a leader (this might imply that some of you will be in charge of two papers but remember that you should read ALL papers)</i></p> <p>Required readings</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Margolis, J. D., & Walsh, J. P. 2003. "Misery Loves Companies: Rethinking Social Initiatives by Business". <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>, 48(2): 268-304. 2. Devinney TM. 2009. Is the socially responsible corporation a myth? The good, the bad, and the ugly of corporate social responsibility. <i>Academy of Management Perspectives</i> 23(2): 44-56. 3. Porter M, Kramer MR. 2011. Creating Shared Value. <i>Harvard Business Review</i> Jan-Feb: 4-17. 4. Walley N, Whitehead B. 1994. It's not easy being green. <i>Harvard Business Review</i> 72(3): 46-52. 5. Friedman M. 1970. The social responsibility of business is to increase its profits. New York 6. Carroll AB, Shabana KM. 2010. The business case for corporate social responsibility: A review of concepts, research and practice. <i>International Journal of Management Reviews</i> 12(1): 85-105. 7. Hoffman AJ. 2005. Business decisions and the environment: Significance, challenges, and momentum of an emerging research field. In <i>Decision Making for the Environment: Social and Behavioral Science Research Priorities</i>. Brewer G, Stern P (eds.), National Research Council, National Academies Press: Washington D.C. 8. Dyllick T, Hockerts K. 2002. Beyond the business case for corporate sustainability. <i>Business Strategy and The Environment</i> 11(2): 130-141. 9. Marshall JD, Toffel MW. 2005. Framing the elusive concept of sustainability: A sustainability hierarchy. <i>Environmental Science & Technology</i> 39(3): 673-682. <p>Assignment for class preparation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is CSR and Sustainability? 2. What is the social responsibility of business? 3. Why do firms engage in CSR practices? Why sustain anything? 4. What is the link between CSR and firm's performance? 5. Is the creation of shared value feasible and recommended or is it a myth? 6. If CSR and sustainability practices are a cost, how should firms manage the trade-off between social initiatives and profitability of firms? 	<p>Introduction to the course</p> <p>Defining the boundaries of CSR and Sustainability</p> <p>January, 12th 15:00-16:15 16.30-17.45</p> <p>Prof. Berrone</p>

	<p>7. If CSR and sustainability practices have a positive impact on firm's results, why don't all firms engage in social practices?</p> <p>8. Read the "The Sustainable Development Timeline." By the International Institute for Sustainable Development http://www.iisd.org/pdf/2009/sd_timeline_2009.pdf</p> <p>Optional readings</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Porter ME, Kramer MR. 2006. Strategy & Society: The Link between Competitive Advantage and Corporate Social Responsibility. Harvard Business Review 84(12): 78-92. 2. Berman SL, Wicks AC, Kotha S, Jones TM. 1999. Does Stakeholder Orientation Matter? The Relationship between Stakeholder Management Models and Firm Financial Performance. Academy of Management Journal 42(5): 488-506. 3. Hillman AJ, Keim GD. 2001. Shareholder Value, Stakeholder Management, and Social Issues: What's the Bottom Line? Strategic Management Journal 22(2): 125-139. 4. Jaffe AB, Peterson SR, Portney PR, Stavins RN. 1995. Environmental regulation and the competitiveness of U.S. manufacturing: What does the evidence tell us? Journal of Economic Literature 33(1): 132-163. 5. Margolis JD, Elfenbein HA, Walsh JP. 2009. Does it pay to be good...and does it matter? A meta-analysis of the relationship between corporate social and financial performance SSRN. 6. Orlizky M, Schmidt FL, Rynes SL. 2003. Corporate social and financial performance: A meta-analysis. Organization Studies 24(3): 403-441. 7. Surroca J, Tribo J, Waddock SA. 2010. Corporate responsibility and financial performance: the role of intangible resources. Strategic Management Journal 31(5): 463-490. 	
2	<p>Required readings</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lounsbury, Michael, Marc J. Ventresca, and Paul M. Hirsch. 2003. "Social Movements, Field Frames and Industry Emergence: A Cultural-Political Perspective on U.S. Recycling." Socio-Economic Review 1(1):71-104. 2. King, B G, and S A Soule. 2007. "Social movements as extra-institutional entrepreneurs: The effect of protests on stock price returns." Administrative Science Quarterly 52(3):413-442. 3. King, B G. 2008. "A political mediation model of corporate response to social movement activism." Administrative Science Quarterly 53(3):395-421. 4. Weber, Klaus, Kathryn L. Heinze, and Michaela DeSoucey. 2008. "Forage for Thought: Mobilizing Codes in the Movement for Grass-fed Meat and Dairy Products." Administrative Science Quarterly 53(3):529-67. 5. Weber, Klaus, Hayagreeva Rao, and L. G. Thomas. 2009. "From Streets to Suites: How the Anti- Biotech Movement 	<p>Social Movements, CSR and Sustainability</p> <p>January, 19th 15:00-16:15 16.30-17.45</p> <p>Prof. Ferraro</p>

	<p>Affected German Pharmaceutical Firms." <i>American Sociological Review</i> 74(1):106-27.</p> <p>6. King, Brayden G., and Nicholas A. Pearce. 2010. "The Contentiousness of Markets: Politics, Social Movements, and Institutional Change in Markets." <i>Annual Review of Sociology</i> 36(1):249-67</p> <p><u>Assignment for class preparation:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the key contribution of social movement theory to understanding Corporate Social Responsibility? 2. What are the mechanisms through which social movements can influence corporate behavior? 3. How can we revisit the debate on the business case for sustainability in the light of these articles? 4. What are the limitations of this perspective and how can we overcome them? 	
3	<p>Required readings</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Hafner-Burton, Emilie, and Kiyoteru Tsutsui. 2005. "Human Rights in a Globalizing World: The Paradox of Empty Promises." <i>American Journal of Sociology</i> 110(5):1373-1411. 2. Bartley, T. 2007. "Institutional Emergence in an Era of Globalization: The Rise of Transnational Private Regulation of Labor and Environmental Conditions" <i>American Journal of Sociology</i> 113(2):297-351. 3. Marc Schneiberg, Tim Bartley (2010), <i>Regulating or redesigning finance? Market architectures, normal accidents, and dilemmas of regulatory reform</i>, in Michael Lounsbury, Paul M. Hirsch (ed.) <i>Markets on Trial: The Economic Sociology of the U.S. Financial Crisis: Part A (Research in the Sociology of Organizations, Volume 30)</i>, Emerald Group Publishing Limited, pp.281-307 4. Etzion, Dror, and Fabrizio Ferraro. 2010. "The Role of Analogy in the Institutionalization of Sustainability Reporting." <i>Organization Science</i> 21(5):1092-1107 5. Bartley, Tim, and Curtis Child. Forthcoming. "Movements , Markets , and Fields: The Effects of Anti-Sweatshop Campaigns on U . S . Firms , 1993-2000." <i>Social Forces</i>. 6. Ioannou, Ioannis and George Serafeim. "The Consequences of Mandatory Corporate Sustainability Reporting" SSRN working paper (http://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=1799589) <p><u>Assignment for class preparation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ What is the outcome of private regulation? Is it a substitute of traditional regulation, or a complement? ➤ What are the criteria to define successful private regulation? What are the antecedents of it? ➤ More broadly, what can we learn from these projects on how to promote sustainability? ➤ What is the relationship between private regulation, social movements, and corporation? 	<p>Transnational Private Regulation, Ratings, and Reporting January, 26th 15:00-16:15 16.30-17.45</p> <p>Prof. Ferraro</p>

	<p>➤ Does reporting matter? Why? And How does it lead to more sustainable corporate behavior?</p>	
4	<p>Required readings</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lounsbury, M., & Hirsch, P. (2010). Markets on trial: Toward a policy-oriented economic sociology. <i>Research in the Sociology of Organizations</i>, 30A, 5–26. 2. Fligstein, Neil, and Jacob Habinek. 2011. "The Spread of the Worldwide Financial Crisis, 2007-2010." <i>Working Paper</i>. 3. Mackenzie, Donald. 2011. "The Credit Crisis as a Problem in the Sociology of Knowledge Sociology of Knowledge 1." <i>American Journal of Sociology</i> 116(6):1778-1841. 4. Hong, Harrison, and Marcin Kacperczyk. 2009. "The price of sin: The effects of social norms on markets." <i>Journal of Financial Economics</i> 93(1):15-36. 5. Ioannou, Ioannis and George Serafeim. "The Impact of Corporate Social Responsibility on Investment Recommendations", SSRN working paper (http://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=1507874) <p><u>Assignment for class preparation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Are the centrality of financial markets and financial institutions a barrier to developing more sustainable corporate practices? ➤ What led us to the 2008 financial crisis? Was it just greed? Or macro policy decisions? Or just bad models? ➤ Could financial market become an engine for sustainability? How? ➤ What prevents responsible investing from diffusing? ➤ Compare the debate on responsible investing with the broader one on CSR? What are the similarities and differences? 	<p>Sociology of Finance, Financial Crisis, and Responsible Investing</p> <p>February, 2nd 15:00-16:15 16.30-17.45</p> <p>Prof. Ferraro</p>
5	<p><i>Please decide the distribution among yourselves, and let me know who will be in charge of what by February 6th. Make sure that ALL papers are assigned and have a leader (this might imply that some of you will be in charge of two papers but remember that you should read ALL papers)</i></p> <p>Required readings</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Aguilera RV, Hupp DE, Williams CA, Ganapathi J. 2007. Putting the S Back in CSR: A multilevel theory of social change in organizations. <i>Academy of Management Review</i> 32(3): 836–863. 2. Donaldson T, Preston LE. 1995. The Stakeholder Theory of the Corporation: Concepts, Evidence, and Implications. <i>Academy of Management Review</i> 20(1): 65–91. 3. Hart SL. 1995. A natural-resource-based view of the firm. <i>Academy of Management Review</i> 20(4): 986– 	<p>Theoretical approaches to CSR and Sustainability</p> <p>February, 9th 15:00-16:15 16.30-17.45</p> <p>Prof. Berrone</p>

	<p>1014.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Hoffman AJ. 2001. Linking organizational and field-level analyses. <i>Organization & Environment</i> 14(2): 133-252. 5. Laplume A, Sonpar K, Litz RA. 2008. Stakeholder theory: Reviewing a theory that moves us. <i>Journal of Management</i> 34(6): 1152-1189. 6. Baron DP, Diermeier D. 2007. Strategic activism and nonmarket strategy. <i>Journal of Economics & Management Strategy</i> 16(3): 599-634. 7. Campbell JL. 2007. Why would corporations behave in socially responsible ways? An institutional theory of corporate social responsibility. <i>Academy of Management Review</i> 32(3): 946-967. <p><u>Assignment for class preparation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ What is the right level of analysis for CSR related issues? ➤ What are the pros and cons of the different theoretical approaches applied to CSR and sustainability? ➤ Can be the different approaches blended? What empirical challenges would this represent? ➤ What are the elements and features of good theorizing in CSR and Sustainability? What are the common errors and features of bad theorizing? ➤ What empirical questions do these approaches offer as avenues for future research? Any managerial implications? <p><u>Optional readings</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Aragon-Correa JA, Sharma S. 2003. A contingent resource-based view of proactive corporate environmental strategy. <i>Academy of Management Review</i> 28(1): 71-88. 2. Jensen MC. 2001. Value Maximization, Stakeholder Theory, and the Corporate Objective Function. <i>Journal of Applied Corporate Finance</i> 14(3): 8-21. 3. Etzion D. 2007. Research on organizations and the natural environment, 1992-Present: A review. <i>Journal of Management</i> 33(4): 637-664. 4. Hill C, Jones TM. 1992. Stakeholder-Agency Theory. <i>Journal of Management Studies</i> 29(2): 131-154. 5. Baron DP. 2009. A positive theory of moral management, social pressure, and corporate social performance. <i>Journal of Economics & Management Strategy</i> 18(1): 7-47 	
6	<p><i>Please decide the distribution among yourselves, and let me know who will be in charge of what by February 14th. Make sure that ALL papers are assigned and have a leader (this might imply that some of you will be in charge of two papers. Remember that you should read ALL papers)</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bansal P, Clelland I. 2004. Talking trash: Legitimacy, impression management, and unsystematic risk in the 	<p>Contextual-factors & The Quest for Legitimacy: Managing institutional environments and stakeholders' demands</p> <p>February, 17th</p>

<p>context of the natural environment. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i> 47(1): 93-103.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Berrone P, Gelabert L, Fosfuri A. 2009. The impact of symbolic and substantive actions on environmental legitimacy. In <i>IESE Working paper series</i>. Barcelona, Spain. 3. Delmas M, Toffel MW. 2004. Stakeholders and Environmental Management Practices: An Institutional Framework. <i>Business Strategy and the Environment</i> 13(4): 209-222. 4. Elsbach KD, Sutton RI. 1992. Acquiring organizational legitimacy through illegitimate actions: A marriage of institutional and impression management theories. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i> 35(4): 699-738. 5. Kacperczyk A. 2009. With greater power comes greater responsibility? Takeover protection and corporate attention to stakeholders. <i>Strategic Management Journal</i> 30: 261-285. 6. Post JE, Preston LE, Sachs S. 2002. Managing the Extended Enterprise: The New Stakeholder View. <i>California Management Review</i> 45(1): 6-28. 7. Waddock SA. 2008. Building a new institutional infrastructure for corporate responsibility. <i>Academy of Management Perspectives</i> 22(3): 87-108. 8. Hart SL, Sharma S. 2004. Engaging fringe stakeholders for competitive imagination. <i>Academy of Management Executive</i> 18: 7-18. <p><u>Assignment for class preparation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ What are the relevant institutions when it comes to sustainability issues? ➤ How do stakeholders cause policies – and boundaries – to change? ➤ What is the best path to sustainability? Confrontation or collaboration? ➤ Why is legitimacy important for firms? ➤ Who grants legitimacy? ➤ How do firms acquire, maintain, and enhance legitimacy? ➤ How are stakeholders identified and prioritize? ➤ How do firms manage conflicting interest of stakeholders? <p><u>Optional readings</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Kassinis G, Vafeas N. 2006. Stakeholder pressures and environmental performance. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i> 49(1): 145-159. 2. Murrillo-Luna JL, Garcés-Ayerbe C, Rivera-Torres P. 2008. Why do patterns of environmental response differ? A stakeholder pressure approach. <i>Strategic Management Journal</i> 29: 1225-1240. 3. Rowley T. 1997. Moving beyond dyadic ties: A network theory of stakeholder influences. <i>Academy of Management</i> 	<p>14:55-16:10 16.25-17.40</p> <p>Prof. Berrone</p>
---	---

	Review 22(4): 897-910.	
7	<p><i>Please decide the distribution among yourselves, and let me know who will be in charge of what by February 20th. Make sure that ALL papers are assigned and have a leader (this might imply that some of you will be in charge of two papers. Remember that you should read ALL papers)</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Berrone P, Gomez-Mejia L. 2009a. Environmental performance and executive compensation: An integrated agency-institutional perspective. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i> 52(1): 103-126. 2. Coombs JE, Gilley KM. 2005. Stakeholder management as a predictor of CEO compensation: Main effects and interactions with financial performance. <i>Strategic Management Journal</i> 26(9): 827-840. 3. David P, Bloom M, Hillman A. 2007. Investor activism, managerial responsiveness, and corporate social performance. <i>Strategic Management Journal</i> 28: 91-100. 4. Hillman A, Keim G, Luce R. 2001. Board Composition and Stakeholder Performance: Do Stakeholder Directors Make a Difference? <i>Business Society</i> 40(3): 295-314. 5. Johnson RA, Greening DW. 1999. The effects of corporate governance and institutional ownership types on corporate social performance. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i> 42(5): 564-576. 6. Kassinis G, Vafeas N. 2002. Corporate boards and outside stakeholders as determinants of environmental litigation. <i>Strategic Management Journal</i> 23(5): 399-415. 7. Luoma P, Goodstein J. 1999. Stakeholders and corporate boards: Institutional influences on board composition and structure. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i> 42(5): 553-563. <p><u>Assignment for class preparation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ What is the causal relation between CSR and Governance structure? ➤ Which level of governance is the most relevant for CSR related issues? ➤ What are the pros and cons of rewarding social responsibility at the top? <p><u>Optional readings</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Berrone P, Cruz C, Gomez-Mejia L, Larraza-Kintana M. 2010. Socioemotional wealth and corporate responses to institutional pressures: Do family-controlled firms pollute less? <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i> 55: 82-113. 2. Berrone P, Gomez-Mejia L. 2009b. The pros and cons of rewarding social responsibility at the top. <i>Human Resource Management</i> 48(6): 957- 969. 	<p>Firm-level factors: Ownership, Monitoring and Incentives affecting CSR and Sustainability</p> <p>February, 23th 15:00-16:15 16.30-17.45</p> <p>Prof. Berrone</p>

	<p>3. Kock CJ, Santalo J, Diestre L. in press. Corporate governance and the environment: What type of governance creates greener companies? <i>Journal of Management Studies</i>.</p> <p>4. Walls J, Berrone P, Phan PH. in press. Corporate governance and environmental performance. Is there really a link? <i>Strategic Management Journal</i>.</p>	
<p>8</p>	<p><i>Please decide the distribution of the five topics below among yourselves, and let me know who will be in charge of what by February 27th. Make sure that ALL sections are assigned and have a leader.</i></p> <p>I. As an <i>introduction to the literature on Strategies for the BOP</i>:</p> <p>Prahalad, C.K. and S. Hart. (2002). "The fortune at the bottom of the pyramid." <i>Strategy & Business</i>, 26: 2-14.</p> <p>Hart, S. and C. Christensen. (2002). "The great leap: Driving innovation from the base of the pyramid." <i>Sloan Management Review</i>, 44(1): 51-56.</p> <p>London, T. and S. Hart. (2004). "Reinventing strategies for emerging markets: Beyond the transnational model." <i>Journal of International Business Studies</i>, 35.5, pp. 350-370.</p> <p>In the session we will also debate three different approaches business models:</p> <p>II. Entrepreneurship:</p> <p>Amit, R., and Zott, C. (2001), "Value creation in e-business," <i>Strategic Management Journal</i>, 22, pp. 493-520.</p> <p>Zott, C. and Amit, R. (2010) "Designing your future business model: An activity system perspective, " <i>Long Range Planning</i>, 43, pp. 216-226.</p> <p>III. Dynamic Capabilities</p> <p>Teece, D.J. (2007), "Explicating dynamic capabilities: The nature and microfoundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance," <i>Strategic Management Journal</i>, 28, pp 1319-1350.</p> <p>Teece, D.J. (2010), "Business models, business strategy and innovation," <i>Long Range Planning</i>, 43, pp. 172-194.</p> <p>IV. Industrial Organization</p> <p>Casadesus-Masanell, R., and Xhu, Feng (2010) "Strategies to fight ad-sponsored rivals", <i>Management Sciences</i>, 56, no. 9, pp. 1484-1499.</p>	<p>BOP and Business Models</p> <p>March, 1st 9.30-10:45 11.00-12.15</p> <p>Prof. Ricart</p>

	<p>Casadesus-Masanell, R., and Ricart, J.E. (2010) "From strategy to business models and to tactics", Long Range Planning, 43, pp. 195-215</p> <p><i>V. Finally we will focus on business models for the BOP with:</i></p> <p>Sánchez, P.; Ricart, J.E. "Business Model Innovation and Sources of Value Creation in Low-Income Markets". <i>European Management Review</i> (2010) 7, 138-154.</p> <p><u>Assignment for class preparation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ What are the main messages from this literature? ➤ What are the implications for MNC? And for local companies? ➤ What is different with respect to the traditional approach to strategies for emerging countries? ➤ What characterizes business models for the BOP? ➤ How each approach to business models contributes to strategies for the BOP? ➤ What are the implications of this literature for business model research? ➤ What are the general implications for our understanding of strategy? 	
<p>9</p>	<p><i>Please decide the distribution among yourselves, and let me know who will be in charge of what by March 5th. Make sure that ALL papers are assigned and have a leader (this might imply that some of you might be in charge of the same paper. Remember that you should read ALL papers)</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Agle BR, Mitchell RK, Sonnenfeld JA. 1999. Who matters to managers? An investigation of stakeholder attributes and salience, corporate performance, and manager values. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i> 42(5): 507-525. 2. Hay R, Gray E. 1974. Social responsibilities of business managers. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i> 17(1): 135-143. 3. Hemingway CA. 2005. Personal Values as a Catalyst for Corporate Social Entrepreneurship. <i>Journal of Business Ethics</i> 60(3): 233-249. 4. Mitchell RK, Agle BR, Wood DJ. 1997. Toward a theory of stakeholder identification and salience: Defining the principle of who and what really counts. <i>Academy of Management Review</i> 22: 853-886. 5. Sharma S. 2000. Managerial interpretations and organizational context as predictors of corporate choice of environmental strategy. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i> 43(4): 581-597. 6. Benabou R, Tirole J. 2010. Individual and corporate social responsibility. <i>Economica</i> 77: 1-19. 	<p>Individual factors: The role of managers in deciding social issues</p> <p>March, 8th 15:00-16:15 16.30-17.45</p> <p>Prof. Berrone</p>

	<p>7. Cespa G, Cestone G. 2009. Corporate social Responsibility and managerial entrenchment. <i>Journal of Economics & Management Strategy</i> 16(3): 741–771.</p> <p><u>Assignment for class preparation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Are managers passive or active actors in the decision process of social issues? ➤ What are their motivations? ➤ How do/should managers prioritize stakeholders demands? ➤ 	
10	<p><i>Please decide the distribution among yourselves, and let me know who will be in charge of what by March 9th. Make sure that ALL papers are assigned and have a leader (this might imply that some of you might be in charge of the same paper. Remember that you should read ALL papers)</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Hoffman AJ, Haigh N. 2011. Positive deviance for a sustainable world: Linking sustainability and positive organizational scholarship. In <i>Handbook of Positive Organizational Scholarship</i>. Cameron K, Spreitzer G (eds.), Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK. 2. Lockett A, Moon J, Visser W. 2006. Corporate social responsibility in management research: Focus, nature, salience and sources of influence. <i>Journal of Management Studies</i> 43(1): 115–135. 3. Williams CA, Aguilera RV. 2008. Corporate Social Responsibility in Comparative Perspective. In <i>Oxford Handbook of Corporate Social Responsibility</i>. Crane A, McWilliams A, Matten D, Moon J, Siegel D (eds.), Oxford University Press: Oxford. 4. Chatterjee A, Levine D, Toffel MW. 2009. How well do social ratings actually measure corporate social responsibility? <i>Journal of Economics & Management Strategy</i> 18(1): 125–169. 5. Walls JL, Phan PH, Berrone P. 2011. Measuring environmental strategy: Construct development, reliability, and validity. <i>Business and Society</i> 50(1): 71–115. 6. Wood DJ. 2010. Measuring corporate social performance: A review. <i>International Journal of Management Reviews</i> 12(1): 50–84. <p><u>Assignment for class preparation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ What are the main opportunities for a scholar in the field of CSR and Sustainability? ➤ Can we really measure CSR reliably? ➤ What issues are critical to write a top article in the field? <p>Good research is made useful by delivering its purpose,</p>	<p>Professional development: Opportunities and challenges for publishing in the field of social issues</p> <p>March, 14th 11:00–12:15 12.30–13.45</p> <p>Prof. Berrone</p>

<p>methodology, results, and implications. Thus, communication (both oral and written) is essential to avoid wasting all the effort that went into research. If communication is poorly done, research will never disseminate knowledge nor be used to aid decision making.</p> <p>During the second part of this session, <u>students will present their "research ideas"</u>. This session is intended to reinforce your communication abilities needed in the research business and get some feedback on your research ideas. Each student will have about 5 minutes (elevator pitch format) to present his/her ideas but should be ready to answer questions from the other classmates and the professor.</p>	
---	--